



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/079,738	02/21/2002	Kenneth J. Smith	D5151	7619
30410	7590	10/09/2003	EXAMINER	
INTERNATIONAL TRUCK INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COMPANY, 4201 WINFIELD ROAD P.O. BOX 1488 WARRENVILLE, IL 60555			FORD, JOHN K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3753	

DATE MAILED: 10/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

10/079, 738

Smith et al.

Examiner

FORD

Art Unit

3743

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
 Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims 1-4 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

- 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) _____.
- 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) Other: _____

Applicants are apparently employees of International Truck. The prior art submitted appears to be largely drawn from patent literature and it is appreciated. The Examiner's concern however is different. Are applicants aware of any systems made by PACCAR, in particular for their Kenworth or Peterbilt lines, which use the slide-in heater core such as claimed in claim 10? The Examiner, by no means, is attempting to suggest that applicants have not complied with their duty of disclosure, however the Examiner is attempting to enlist applicants' help in obtaining the most relevant prior art. Applicants, being in the trucking industry, may have knowledge of air conditioner/heater units, which is not available in patent literature. Counsel is requested to make the Examiner's request directly to applicants to see if such non-patent prior art is available and may have been overlooked when the IDS was prepared.

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-9, drawn to a combined heating, cooling system and vehicle wherein the orientation of the cooler, fan and heater, in that order, on opposite sides of the vehicle dash panel is specified classified in class 296, subclass 208.
- II. Claims 10-14, drawn to a heater/cooling unit with two modules, classified in class 165, subclass 202

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

Inventions I and II are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In this case the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because combination claim 1 recites details of the heater mounting with far less specificity than subcombination claim 10 (which recites slide slots for the heater and a pulse count actuator). The subcombination has separate utility such as by itself entirely within or entirely outside the vehicle passenger compartment.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A telephone call was made to Mr. Kalfa on September to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to John Ford at telephone number 703-308-2636.



John K. Ford
Primary Examiner